United Nations A/C.1/58/PV.17

General Assembly
Fifty-eighth session

Official Records

First Committee
17th meeting
Tuesday, 2[illegible]er 2003, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Sareva ..... (Finland)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda items 62 to 80 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: This morning the First Committee will continue taking action on draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper No. 2, which was circulated during yesterday's meeting, starting again with cluster 1, nuclear weapons.

In this connection I should like to inform the Committee that, at the request of the delegation of Nigeria, action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.11, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba)", contained in cluster 1, has been postponed to a later stage of the Committee's work.

I should also like to inform members that this morning the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.50, action on the text of which was postponed yesterday because of the lack of a statement on the programme budget implications.

After completing action on the one draft resolution now contained in cluster 1 for today, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, conventional weapons, starting with draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.50, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", followed by draft resolutions A/C.1/58/L.9 and A/C.1/58/L.10 in cluster 5, draft resolutions A/C.1/58/L.32 and A/C.1/58/L.45 in cluster 6, and, finally, draft resolutions A/C.1/58/L.5 and A/C.1/58/L.13 in cluster 7.

In proceeding with our work I should like to remind delegations that the Committee will follow the procedure, already outlined, regarding consolidated explanations of vote both before and after the voting, which we successfully used yesterday. Therefore, I once again appeal to all delegations kindly to observe the outlined procedure and to avoid any interruptions once voting on a cluster commences.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31, contained in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, as appears in informal working paper No. 2, I shall call on those delegations wishing to make a general statement, other than in explanation of vote, or to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Ms. Inoguchi (Japan): I have asked to speak in order to orally introduce an amendment to Japan's draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.53, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". Based on consultations that we have conducted with delegations over the past weeks, we have made a minor revision to the sixth preambular paragraph. To be specific, we have deleted the qualifier "recent" before the word "challenges" in this paragraph. I believe that this revision will not cause a problem for any delegation, but rather will clarify the meaning of this important paragraph on compliance with the Treaty on the Non-

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

03-58306 (E)

Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Allow me once again to express our hope that the draft resolution will be supported by an overwhelming majority.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31.

A recorded vote has been requested.

The Committee will first vote on operative paragraph 1 and thereafter on the draft resolution as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on operative paragraph 1.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 24 October 2003. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/58/L.31 and A/C.1/58/INF/2.

The Committee will first take action on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31, which reads:

> "Underlines once again the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic Republic of Congo, Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America

Abstaining:

Belarus, France, Georgia, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31 was retained by 140 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Haiti informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31 as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi,

Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Serbia Montenegro, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31 as a whole was adopted by 104 votes to 29, with 20 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Australia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain; the delegation of Kenya, that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Pilot (Luxembourg): As I am speaking for the first time may I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee, and on the outstanding manner in which you have led our debates up to now.

(*spoke in French*)

I have the honour to speak on behalf of Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands, as well as Germany, Bulgaria, Denmark, Spain, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Poland and Portugal, who associate themselves with this explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons".

We support the unanimous conclusion of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. That is why we voted in favour of the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution.

While we share the view that the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we cannot support the draft resolution as a whole. We regret the fact that the draft resolution refers to only one element of the advisory opinion of the ICJ. The advisory opinion is indivisible and must be considered in its entirety. Furthermore, we are firmly convinced that nuclear disarmament can be achieved only through a gradual process. At the Sixth Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, States Parties proclaimed their agreement to a series of practical measures in this respect. It is on their implementation that the efforts of the international community should be focused.

Ms. Inoguchi (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's position on the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons".

First, we highly appreciate Malaysia's sincere attitude and firm commitment to the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament which led to the proposing of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31. Japan also believes that because of their immense power to cause destruction, death and injury to human beings, the use of nuclear weapons is clearly contrary to the fundamental humanitarianism which informs international law and provides its philosophical foundation. Therefore we would like to stress that nuclear weapons should never be used again and continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. However, the advisory opinion of the ICJ, which this draft resolution addresses, clearly demonstrates the complexity of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the judges of the ICJ on the existing obligation under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on the matter in good faith. Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to achieve steady, step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. In this context we believe it is premature to call upon all States

> "immediately to fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons". (*A/C.1/58/L.31, para. 2*)

I believe that steady, incremental progress should be made prior to our embarking upon the negotiations that draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31 calls upon all States to commence. That is the reason for Japan's abstention on the draft resolution.

Finally, Japan continues to encourage all efforts to advance nuclear disarmament.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, conventional weapons, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.50, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects".

Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/58/L.50 and A/C.1/58/L.51? I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.50.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.50, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/58/L.50 and A/C.1/58/INF/2. In addition, Uruguay has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

In connection with the draft resolution, I wish to put on record the following statements on financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

By operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would

> "request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention to be held on 27 and 28 November 2003, as well as for any possible continuation of work after the Meeting, should the States parties deem it appropriate".

The Assembly would

> "also request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, to continue to inform the General Assembly periodically, by electronic means, of ratifications and acceptance of and accession to the Convention and the Protocols annexed thereto".

The Secretary-General wishes to draw the attention of members to the fact that cost estimates for servicing the Meeting of States parties, to be held on 27 and 28 November 2003, have been prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the States Parties at the Meeting of States Parties held at Geneva on 12 and 13 December 2002. It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, that under their respective legal arrangements ought to be financed

outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.50 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.51.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.51, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mali at the 13th meeting of the Committee on 22 October 2003. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/58/L.51 and A/C.1.58/INF/2. In addition, Malta has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.51 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 5, regional disarmament and security, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.9, entitled "Regional disarmament", and then draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.10. We will follow the procedure outlined earlier and used yesterday.

Does any delegation wish to make a general statement before a decision is taken on these two draft resolutions? I see none.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 5 before a decision is taken. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.9.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.9, entitled "Regional disarmament", which was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 13th meeting on 22 October 2003. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/58/L.9 and A/C.1/58/INF/2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.9 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.9 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.10.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.10, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", which was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 13th meeting on 22 October 2003. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/58/L.10 and A/C.1/58/INF/2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Mr. Varma (India): This intervention should come as no surprise as we had registered a request with the Secretariat for a vote on this draft resolution and we ask that it be taken.

The Chairman: As a recorded vote has been requested by India I call now on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.10.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.10 was adopted by 158 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: I shall now call on the representative of India who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Varma (India): Thank you, Sir, for the opportunity to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.10, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

We proceed from the fact that since 1993 there exist consensus guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security, which were adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission. These guidelines were adopted by consensus. Therefore, the rationale or need to consider a formulation of principles for a framework for regional arrangements, as is contained in the draft resolution, is not persuasive. India is not convinced of the productive value of calling on the Conference on Disarmament, a forum for negotiating disarmament instruments of global application, to consider principles for a framework for regional arrangements on conventional arms control. Further, we proceed also from the fact that our security parameters cannot be confined to an artificially defined region. That being the case, the narrow definition of the draft resolution does not fully reflect the security concerns, and adopts an approach that is far too restrictive. It is for these reasons that we called for a vote and voted in the manner that we did on this draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.32 and then proceeding to draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45.

I do not have any requests to make general statements. I call now on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Alhariri (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45, entitled "Transparency in armaments". The Syrian Arab Republic completely supports the shared position of the Arab States, members of the League of Arab States, regarding transparency in armaments. Syria reaffirms its

complete support for the creation of a world that is free of the use of force or of the threat of force, a world in which peace, equality and justice prevail as principles. We are prepared to participate in any international effort aimed, in good faith, at attaining that objective. Likewise, we wish to draw attention to the fact that the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments" does not take into account the specific situation in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli conflict continues in the region because of the continued occupation by Israel of Arab territories and Israel's refusal to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions, and because of Israel's possession of the deadliest and most sophisticated weapons, its capacity to develop sophisticated weaponry, in particular nuclear weapons, and to accumulate those weapons locally. All this confirms that the transparency Israel claims to want in the field of armaments only covers the tiniest part of its sophisticated arsenals of deadly nuclear weapons.

Mr. Gala (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 3 and 8 and a sentence in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 as a package, on the basis of the following elements. The recommendations of the group of experts contained in the report of the Secretary-General, which this draft resolution claims to endorse, are substantive recommendations with practical, wide-ranging implications. The conclusions of the group of experts do not represent the opinions of all Member States, because, as is known, the group is of limited composition. Member States have the legitimate right to have a reasonable time period for assessing these recommendations which, because of their implications, require the involvement in our countries of parties from different sectors.

In our view a procedure is being followed that is not very participative because we are being compelled to accept the recommendations contained in that report of the Secretary-General without having had the opportunity to take a stand and have an exchange of views on them. Procedures such as these, instead of contributing to the progressive development of the Register and its universality, seem to have the opposite effect. My delegation expressed its concerns regarding this draft resolution and at that time we suggested that we take note of the report and ask the Secretary-General to seek the opinions of Member States regarding the recommendations of the group of experts and that a fresh report be submitted for consideration at the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

The suggestions of our delegation, unfortunately, were not taken into account. Cuba considers that transparency with regard to armaments is an important factor in creating an environment of confidence and détente among States. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is a concrete measure that can contribute to that objective. Cuba has been participating every year in the Register and has submitted the corresponding information within the proper deadlines to the United Nations Secretariat. Nonetheless, my delegation wishes to reiterate that the Register must be well balanced, comprehensive and non-discriminatory and must promote the national, regional and international security of all States in accordance with international law.

In order to achieve the universalization of this instrument, it must also include weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, as a provisional measure towards their complete elimination, which is the only definitive solution to eradicate the dangers involved in the existence of these weapons. Account should also be taken of the fact that all States have the right to self-defence enshrined in the United Nations Charter and therefore the right to acquire weapons for their own security, including from external sources. Consequently, legal transfers of arms cannot be prohibited.

The Register is a confidence-building measure, which must not obviate the legitimate security needs of States. It is a measure that is complemented by others that are applied at the national, regional and global levels. Cuba believes that the voluntary nature of the Register is appropriate to allow for transparency in armaments and confidence-building.

The inclusion in the Register of information related to sophisticated conventional weapons, weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and transfers of equipment and technology directly related to the development and production of such weapons, whose destructive power and destabilizing potential far exceeds that of conventional weapons, would make the Register a better balanced, more comprehensive instrument. For these reasons, Cuba is not able to join the consensus on this draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.32. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.32, entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Germany at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 23 October 2003. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/58/L.32 and A/C.1/58/INF/2. In addition, Finland has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.32 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.32 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I shall now set out in detail how the Committee will vote on the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2. Thereafter, the Committee will take a recorded vote on operative paragraph 3, the words "as well as the 2003 report of the Secretary-General" appearing at the end of operative paragraph 4, and operative paragraph 8. The Committee will then vote on operative paragraph 4 as a whole and, finally, will vote on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 as a whole.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on operative paragraph 2.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45, entitled "Transparency in armaments". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 23 October 2003. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/58/L.45 and A/C.1/58/INF/2.

The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 was retained by 138 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to the second vote, the combination of operative paragraph 3, the words "as well as the 2003 report of the Secretary-General" at the end of operative paragraph 4, and operative paragraph 8.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 3, "Decides to adapt the scope of the Register in conformity with the recommendations contained in the 2003 report of the Secretary-General", the words "as well as the 2003 report of the Secretary-General" at the end of operative paragraph 4, and operative paragraph 8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 3, the last words of operative paragraph 4, and operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 were retained by 138 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 4 as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland,

Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Operative paragraph 4, as a whole, of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 was retained by 137 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 as a whole. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 as a whole was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45, entitled "Transparency in armaments", consistent with our principled position in recent years of advocating a more comprehensive approach towards transparency in armaments. After more than 10 years of operation of the United Nations Register system, for the first time the group of governmental experts has been able to move some inches forward and add new items to the list of seven categories. While Iran constructively participated in the work of this group we repeatedly insisted that transparency in conventional arms without transparency in weapons of mass destruction is unbalanced and lacks comprehensiveness, particularly in the sensitive region of the Middle East where the only non-party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Israel, continues to develop nuclear weapons and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

As is reflected in the report of the 2003 group of governmental experts, particularly in figures 5 and 6 of the report (A/58/274), there has been a pattern of a lack of participation by the countries of West Asia and North Africa in the United Nations Register. That pattern demonstrates that the United Nations Register, which has been in force for more than a decade, is not a popular confidence-building mechanism in West Asia and its neighbourhood due to the legitimate concerns of countries in the region.

Resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, as the basis of the whole initiative, and main term of reference for this subject, has not been fully and faithfully implemented. After more than a decade of the operation of the United Nations Register, there is only a reminder of that resolution in the current draft, while the United Nations Register was supposed to be a first step towards initiating such transparency in all kinds of armaments, including weapons of mass destruction, and, in particular, nuclear weapons. My delegation hopes that in future, a true and comprehensive transparency in armaments, which will include all kinds of armaments, particularly weapons of mass destruction, would be pursued by the General Assembly as was recommended by the 2000 group of governmental experts.

Mr. Alhariri (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The States members of the Arab League wish to confirm once again the position that they expressed on 2 October 2000 on transparency in armaments, especially as regards the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms as is contained in the report of the Secretary-General, as follows.

A few years ago the States members of the Arab League expressed their position on the subject of transparency in armaments. They have been insistent on the relevance of the United Nations Register. These positions and attitudes are well established and clear and are based on a general orientation as regards disarmament and the special character of the situation in the Middle East. The following points reflect the Arab position in this respect.

Members of the Arab League defend transparency in armaments as a means of enhancing international peace and security and they see that any mechanism of transparency to be successful should be guided by certain guidelines and basic principles, namely, they must be transparent, balanced and non-discriminatory and should enhance the security of all countries in the region and throughout the world in accordance with international law. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is the first attempt by the international community, at a very late date, to deal with the subject of transparency at a universal level. We cannot but respect the value of the Register as a universal mechanism and an early warning mechanism. However the Register faces a number of questions, among which is the insistence by almost half the Member States of not providing any information to the Register. In this context the member States of the Arab League consider that despite the very small progress recommended by the group of governmental experts this year, the concerns of the Arab States still exist.

The scope of the Register should be expanded, especially as the experience of recent years has demonstrated that limiting the Register to only seven categories of weapons alone will not lead to the participation of all countries. There are many countries, members of the Arab League, which believe that the Register does not meet their security needs in view of its limited scope. That is why the scope of the Register in future will depend on the desire of the international community to build more confidence and more transparency. In view of the 1991 General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, we think that the scope of the

Register should be expanded to include conventional weapons, nuclear weapons, and weapons of mass destruction and advanced technology with military applications. That will make the Register more comprehensive and less discriminatory and will encourage more countries to participate in the Register.

The Middle East is a special region in this context because the imbalance in weaponry is great. There will be no transparency or confidence in the Middle East unless there is a balanced and comprehensive transparency. The application of transparency in the Middle East to seven categories of weapons, while ignoring the more lethal and destructive weapons such as weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, is neither balanced nor comprehensive and will not have the desired results. In particular, the Register does not take into consideration the situation in the Middle East where Israel continues its occupation of Arab land, still possesses the most lethal weapons of mass destruction, and is the only State in the region that has not acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while insisting on challenging and refusing all international calls from the international community for it to accede to the NPT and to subject all its facilities to the safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency. That has led the members of the NPT at the 2000 Review Conference to call upon Israel to take those steps.

Member States of the Arab League express their regret that the group of governmental experts was unable to expand the scope of the Register or to put weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, on the Register. That contradicts General Assembly resolution 46/36 L by which the Register was established. This failure means that the Register has failed and cannot in its current form be a good means of confidence-building or early warning.

In view of all this, the member States of the Arab League believe that it is necessary to take their concerns into consideration effectively and in a manner that would guarantee universal participation in the Register so that the Register can play its role as a means of early warning and a mechanism of confidence-building that can be counted upon.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I should like to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45. China has always taken a positive attitude towards the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. China submitted its report to the Register at its very inception in 1993. However, since 1996 a certain country has been registering every year its arms sales to Taiwan province of China in the form of a footnote. Such behaviour not only constitutes an interference in China's internal affairs but has also changed the nature of the United Nations Register that only sovereign States can participate in the Register. That is something that China cannot accept. China therefore has been forced to suspend its reporting to the Register since 1998. This practice is the only obstacle to China's submission of its report to the Register and the only reason why China cannot support this draft resolution.

In light of the above, the Chinese delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45. Once again we call upon the country concerned immediately to rectify this mistake and create the necessary conditions for China to resume its participation in the Register.

Mr. Maandi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation is particularly interested in the question of transparency, which is a confidence-building measure that cannot be disregarded in any way. We have always supported initiatives to promote transparency of a genuine kind. However, my delegation did not vote in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments", which is limited in responding to the attempts by many States, and is insensitive to the unbalanced treatment of armaments.

The subject of transparency continues to be held hostage to an over-partial, selective approach. Attempts to move beyond mere transfers of conventional weapons and to say that transparency is the only way have not been fruitful. The latest expert report, drawn up in 2003, was not free from that approach. Like previous reports, this report too continues to be exclusively focused on the establishment of a United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and does not take any account of the need to expand the Register to other categories of weapons. Furthermore, it does not take into account in an appropriate way other aspects of conventional weapons such as national production procurement and other military holdings.

To our mind, transparency is not confined to the transfers of conventional weapons alone. It does not authorize a lack of transparency when it is a question of

the transfer of weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons. It does not authorize an indifference or silence with respect to weapons of mass destruction, particularly when the international community is concerned by small arms and light weapons.

My delegation is convinced that confidence cannot be built only on the basis of weapons or the transfer of conventional weapons. The ultimate goal of the Register as a transparency measure cannot become a reality unless there is an honest universal participation in it and unless steps are taken to cover all categories of weapons. Proper treatment of the various elements of transparency in the area of armaments should not, we believe, proceed from a selective approach, one that is discriminatory. It should seek to establish a register that is a universal, comprehensive system, a register that ultimately requires the reflection of aspects such as national production capacities and related procurement, armaments accumulation and weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and sophisticated technologies with military implications. The importance of the Register is not merely the number of participants but its real contribution to transparency and the establishment of confidence among States. That is the point.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I should like to give an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

Mr. Alhariri (Syrian Arab Republic): As a sponsor of the draft, the representative of Israel has no right to make an explanation.

The Chairman: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic is correct. Sponsors of draft resolutions are not allowed to explain their vote before or after the voting but are allowed to make general statements before action is taken.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel is not a sponsor of the draft resolution. If the list is checked carefully it will be found that Israel is not a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The representative of Israel equally is correct. I call on him now to proceed with his explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Bar (Israel): As in previous years, we have again been forced to listen, in the context of a discussion on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, to a long list of baseless allegations against Israel's security policy and its alleged capabilities. These accusations have nothing to do, of course, with the Register. Most of the countries that criticized Israel are unwilling to subject their own arms transfers to any transparency measure.

The one important advantage of the Register in our opinion is its modesty. It does not pretend to be a solution for all conflicts or for the security challenges many of us face. It is a confidence-building measure that can be used as a basis for a continuation or extension, primarily in a regional context. That is the reason for Israel's participation in the Register. But, for some previous speakers, gradual confidence-building seems to be a reason for concern. They are especially unhappy about Israel's determination to maintain its ability to defend itself.

Israel's self-defence policy is not a source of concern to global peace. There are other real sources of concern in the Middle East. Also, it should not be a source of concern for countries in our region which do not have aggressive intentions against my country. If countries that do have such intentions are concerned by Israel's ability to defend itself, it should be seen as a contribution to regional stability.

Moving from today's environment of heightened tensions to a safer Middle East requires the willingness to seek peace and reconciliation as well as agreements on mutual confidence-building measures. Participating in the Register is an important step in the right direction and we call upon our neighbours to adopt this measure. As in other regions, only when regional transparency measures can be agreed upon between Middle Eastern countries will it be possible to improve and develop the global Register in a substantial manner. At the same time, we view the changes introduced in the Secretary-General's report as an important contribution to the relevancy of the Register, especially the inclusion of man-portable air defence systems, as a result of terrorist attempts to use them against civilian aircraft.

In addition to our support, and to relax my Syrian counterpart, we wish to inform the Chairman and the Secretariat that Israel wishes to add its name to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45, entitled "Transparency in armaments". We believe that transparency in armaments should be universal, non-discriminatory and on a voluntary basis. We should like to stress here that transparency measures should strike a balance and should not be confined only to conventional weapons but should also cover weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.45 is unbalanced since it deals with transparency measures for conventional weapons only and excludes weapons of mass destruction. We respect the good intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution. At the same time we are of the view that only practical and achievable measures should be addressed in this draft resolution. My delegation, like a number of other delegations, has doubts about the necessity and usefulness of the continuation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development. My delegation has reservations on operative paragraphs 2, 4 and 8 on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development. For these reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on separate paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Issa (Egypt): I wish first to associate myself with the statement delivered by Syria on behalf of the States members of the Arab League. Egypt abstained on the draft resolution and on all the separate paragraph votes because we believe that the Register, however commendable it is as a first step towards a confidence-building measure, has not met with success in developing itself in order to address the real essence of the confidence-building challenges that we face. It continues to address the peripheral issues without being able to proceed on the core issues that would make it a truly universal and significant contribution to confidence-building. It is for this reason that the delegation of Egypt abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and on the votes on the separate paragraphs.

However, we wish again to say that despite our abstention, we commend the efforts by the lead sponsor of the draft resolution, the Netherlands, for its transparency and outreach and we certainly do appreciate all the efforts made by the delegation of the Netherlands.

The Chairman: There being no further requests to speak in explanation of voting on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in cluster 7, disarmament machinery. The one draft resolution for action today is contained in document A/C.1/58/L.5, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.5.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.5, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 23 October 2003.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.5 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.13.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.13, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 22 October 2003. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/58/INF/2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.13 was adopted.

Other matters

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to make statements on any other business.

Mr. Trezza (Italy): I am speaking here in New York as the messenger of an Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Informatics. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to provide members of the Committee with information relating to the Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Informatics. This Working Group was established by the Economic and Social Council under resolution 1995/61 of 28 July 1995 with the mandate to facilitate the successful implementation of the initiatives taken by the Secretary-General with regard to the use of information technology.

Over the past few years a technical subgroup of the Working Group has been addressing the question of connectivity between Member States and the United Nations Secretariat at Headquarters. One of the aims is to enhance the interaction between Member States and the Secretariat on practical issues relating to the use of information technology in the work of the United Nations. In this period, the Working Group has played a useful role in the continued improvement of information technology services and training that is provided to United Nations representatives at United Nations Headquarters. These include the provision and maintenance of personal computers in the conference areas for the use of representatives, the broadening of the availability of official documents via the Internet, web site hosting services provided by the Secretariat to Member States, increasing the access for Member States to specialized databases of interest to them, and the development of training programmes provided by the United Nations Secretariat and others for Member States in the use of various information technology services.

At this stage of my short introduction, Members might be wondering what brings me here today. I am here to present a practical tool that we can use in our everyday work and I hope that there will be the opportunity to distribute it in time. One of the latest projects of the Working Group on Informatics is a publication providing representatives with information about the various information technology services provided to representatives by the United Nations Secretariat. This booklet is entitled "Internet Services for Delegates" — which means for us. This short booklet, which is intended as a guide to the information technology services already available, also provides useful tips to help representatives take full advantage of the Internet-based tools, services and resources the United Nations Secretariat provides. As I speak, I hope that copies of this booklet are being distributed to all delegations in the room. They will also be sent to missions in New York in the coming weeks.

To conclude, I should also like to take this opportunity to inform representatives of another project that is being prepared by the working group. This consists of preparing a software programme that will permit representatives, if they so wish, to download on Personal Digital Assistants — the small gadgets that some of us are using — practical data such as the daily *Journal* and other topical information relating to their work at the United Nations. The software for this project is being prepared at the initiative of the delegation of Andorra. A presentation and training session on this project will be held on 19 November 2003 in Conference Room 8. Further details will be available in the Journal. All interested representatives are invited to attend.

Thank you again, Sir, for giving me the opportunity to draw the attention of all representatives to this useful booklet and the activity of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Informatics.

The Chairman: The contents of that statement will be duly noted.

Organization of work

The Chairman: I wish to inform members that at its next meeting the Committee will continue to take action on the draft resolutions contained in informal working paper No. 3, which is currently being distributed to members. As will be seen, there will be one draft resolution from cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, three draft resolutions from cluster 7, disarmament machinery, four draft resolutions and one draft decision from cluster 8, other disarmament measures, one draft decision from cluster 9, related matters of disarmament and international security, and one draft resolution and one draft decision from cluster 10, international security. In all, there will be 12 documents for action at our meeting tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.